



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/658,209	09/10/2003	Barry H. Ginsberg	45716	3221
7590	09/14/2007		EXAMINER	
Stacey J. Longanecker Roylance, Abrams, Berdo & Goodman, L.L.P. Suite 600 1300 19th Street, N.W. Washington, DC 20036			NASSER, ROBERT L	
			ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
			3735	
			MAIL DATE	
			09/14/2007	DELIVERY MODE
				PAPER

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

Office Action Summary	Application No.	Applicant(s)
	10/658,209	GINSBERG, BARRY H.
	Examiner	Art Unit
	Robert L. Nasser	3735

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --
Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

1) Responsive to communication(s) filed on 13 June 2007.
 2a) This action is **FINAL**. 2b) This action is non-final.
 3) Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11; 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

4) Claim(s) 1-4, 6-9, 11, 12, 15-25, 27-30, 32, 33, 35-48, 50, 51, 53-62, 65 and 67-71 is/are pending in the application.
 4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
 5) Claim(s) 15-21, 35-43, 53-62, 65 and 67-70 is/are allowed.
 6) Claim(s) 1-4, 8, 9, 11, 12, 22-25, 27-30, 32, 33, 44-46, 50, 51, and 71 is/are rejected.
 7) Claim(s) 6, 7, 47 and 48 is/are objected to.
 8) Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

9) The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
 10) The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a) accepted or b) objected to by the Examiner.
 Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
 Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
 11) The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

12) Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
 a) All b) Some * c) None of:
 1. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
 2. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
 3. Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

1) Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
 2) Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
 3) Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/08)
 Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____

4) Interview Summary (PTO-413)
 Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____

5) Notice of Informal Patent Application
 6) Other: _____

The examiner regrets that he is new to the case and upon examination, the following rejection was deemed to be pertinent. Accordingly, the finality of the previous rejection is hereby withdrawn and the following new non-final action entered.

Claims 1-4, 6-9, 11, 12, 22,25, 27-30, 32, and 33 are objected to in that it is unclear what the relationship between the announcing step at the top of the claim and the displaying step in the bottom of the claim is. It appears that they are supposed to be the same step, but the relationship is unclear.

The following is a quotation of the second paragraph of 35 U.S.C. 112:

The specification shall conclude with one or more claims particularly pointing out and distinctly claiming the subject matter which the applicant regards as his invention.

Claim 71 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, second paragraph, as being indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which applicant regards as the invention. Claim 71 is rejected in that there is no antecedent basis for the n time periods. As a result, it is unclear exactly what is being claimed and no art is being applied to the claim.

The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

A person shall be entitled to a patent unless –

(e) the invention was described in (1) an application for patent, published under section 122(b), by another filed in the United States before the invention by the applicant for patent or (2) a patent granted on an application for patent by another filed in the United States before the invention by the applicant for patent, except that an international application filed under the treaty defined in section 351(a) shall have the effects for purposes of this subsection of an application filed in the United States only if the international application designated the United States and was published under Article 21(2) of such treaty in the English language.

The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negatived by the manner in which the invention was made.

Claims 1-3, 22, 23, 24, and 44 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) as anticipated by Causey III et al 6558320 or, in the alternative, under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as obvious over Causey III. Causey teaches a device for making multiple measurements of glucose values, and computing an average value of the glucose values, and then allowing a user to scroll through a display sequence that includes the individual values (See column 11, lines 6-8). As such, it receives a user request to annunciate the average and each of the individual measured values in a scroll like (round robin) sequence. The examiner notes that causey does not state that an indicator is displayed. However, the examiner notes that Causey has to have an indicator to be able to identify which data point is being displayed. Alternatively, the examine takes official notice that it is well known to identify the data in a scrolling display. Hence, it would have been obvious to modify Causey to display an indicator, to identify the data. Claims 27 and 28 are rejected in that the processor is "Programmable" to perform the recited function, although it is not programmed to do such.

Claims 4, 8, 9, 11, 12, 25, 29, 30, 32, 33, 45, 46, 50, and 51 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Causey III et al. With respect to claim 4, Causey does not state how many values are used to calculate the average. However, the examiner takes official notice that it is well known to provide an average value with more

than 2 values, to provide a more accurate average. Hence, it would have been obvious to modify to use more than 2 values in the average, in order to provide a better picture of the overall patient condition. As such, the third and so one values would be announced sequentially until the last value has been announced. Claim 11 is rejected in that the exact form of the indicators on the display ha snot been disclosed to be for a particular purpose or to solve a stated problem. As such, the exact form would have been a mere matter of design choice for one skilled in the art, as all indicators appear to function equally as well as the others. Claim 12 is rejected in that the time and day is also displayed. Claims 25, 29, 30, 32, 33, 45, 46, 50, and 51 are rejected for the reasons given above.

Claims 6, 7, and 47-48 are objected to as being dependent upon a rejected base claim, but would be allowable if rewritten in independent form including all of the limitations of the base claim and any intervening claims. Claims 6, 7, 47, and 48 define over the art in that none of the art displays the variability indicator as claimed.

Claims 15-21, 53-62, 65, and 67-69 are allowable in that none of the art selects a stored data point to display if the time period has not passed, as claimed.

Claims 35-43 and 70 are allowable in that none of the art allows the user to select the desired time period for the average.

The prior art made of record and not relied upon is considered pertinent to applicant's disclosure.

Allen III et al teaches in column 1,lines 54-60 a device that displays an average value and individual glucose values.

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Robert L. Nasser whose telephone number is 571 272-4731. The examiner can normally be reached on m-f 9-5.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Charles Marmor II can be reached on 571 272-4730. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). If you would like assistance from a USPTO Customer Service Representative or access to the automated information system, call 800-786-9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 571-272-1000.

/ROBERT L. NASSER JR./

Robert L. Nasser
Primary Examiner
Art Unit 3735

RLN
September 12, 2007